

Application No.: 10/755,009
Amendment Date: June 16, 2005
Reply to Office Action: March 24, 2005
Page 4

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Drawings

Figures 2-4 and 6 stand objected to being “hand drawn”. Accordingly, Applicants are submitting three (3) sheets of formal drawings (Figures 2 and 3; Figure 4; and Figure 6). These drawing sheets are labelled as “Replacement Sheet”.

Claims Status

Claims 1, 3-13 and 15-16 remain in this application. Claims 1, 5 and 11 have been amended. Claims 2 and 14 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DiPasquale et al (US 6,556,346) in view of Mozdy (WO 03/012489).

Applicants amended independent Claims 1 and 11 to specify that the fiber clad diameter is less than 90 μm . Neither of the two cited references discloses this feature. Neither of the two cited references discloses, teaches or suggests the advantages of having such a small clad diameter, nor provides an incentive for doing so.

It is well known to those skilled in the fiber art that optical fibers with smaller clad diameters are more sensitive to microbend losses, and the smaller diameter, the higher the micromend loss sensitivity. Thus, it is not obvious that the performance of optical fibers could be optimised if the clad diameter was reduced below 90 μm , especially if the fiber is tightly coiled (8 mm to 40 mm bent radius).

Since the cited references, in combination, do not disclose all of the features of the applicants claim and, furthermore, provide no incentive to modify their teaching to arrive at the applicants invention, claims 1 and 11 are not obvious over DiPasquale et al (US 6,556,346) in view of Mozdy (WO 03/012489).

Application No.: 10/755,009
Amendment Date: June 16, 2005
Reply to Office Action: March 24, 2005
Page 5

Claims 3-10 depend from claim 1 as their base claim and, therefore, include the language of claim 1. Similarly, claims 12, 13, 15 and 16 depend from claim 11 as their base claim and, therefore, include the language of claim 1. Thus claims 3-10, 12-13, 15 and 16 are not obvious over DiPasquale et al (US 6,556,346) in view of Mozdy (WO 03/012489).

Conclusion

Based upon the above amendments, remarks, and papers of records, applicant believes the pending claims of the above-captioned application are in allowable form and patentable over the prior art of record. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicant believes that no extension of time is necessary to make this Reply timely. Should applicant be in error, applicant respectfully requests that the Office grant such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Reply timely, and hereby authorizes the Office to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with respect to said time extension to the deposit account of the undersigned firm of attorneys, Deposit Account 03-3325.

Please direct any questions or comments to Svetlana Z. Short at 607-974-0412.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: 6/16/05


Svetlana Z. Short
Attorney for Assignee
Registration Number: 34,432
Corning Incorporated, SP-TI-03-1
Corning, NY 14831
Phone: 607-974-0412